UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,195	12/20/2001	Daniel Tunkelang	109878-125	9651

23483 7590 10/26/2006

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
60 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER	
LE, MIRANDA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/027,195	TUNKELANG, DANIEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Miranda Le	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 August 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *08/17/07*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/17/06 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement, filed 08/17/06, has been received, entered into the record, and considered. See attached form PTO-1449.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless:
>
> (e) the invention was described in
>
> (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or
>
> (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-9, 12, 15-23, 25-27, 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al. (US Patent No. 6,853,982 B2).

Smith anticipated independent claims 1, 31-33, 38, by the following:

As to claims 1, 33, Smith teaches a method for searching a collection of items, wherein each item in the collection has a set of properties, comprising the steps of: obtaining a query composed of a first set of one or more properties (i.e. set of ITEM_A, ITEM_C ..., which belongs to query, Fig. 3B, col. 18, lines 14-24), col. 18, lines 14-45, col. 20, lines 34-44);

obtaining a result (i.e. N_{common}, that is the number of sessions in which both ITEM_A and ITEM_B were viewed, col. 19, lines 21-24) based on applying a distance function *(i.e. pseudocode in Table 2, col. 19)* to the query and an item (i.e. SESSION_B, Fig. 3B) in the collection (i.e. database 38, Fig. 1) having a second set of one or more properties (i.e. the set of ITEM_C, ITEM_D..., which belongs to SESSION_B, Fig. 3B), col. 18, lines 8-67, col. 20, lines 6-33),

wherein obtaining a result includes determining a third set of properties (i.e. both ITEM_A and ITEM_B were viewed, col. 19, lines 21-24) common to the first set of one or more properties and the second set of one or more properties are in common between the query (Fig. 3B, col. 18, line 58 to col. 19, line 27);

the distance function determines a distance between the query and an item in the collection based on the number of items in the collection that are associated with all of the properties in the third set of properties *(i.e. ITEM_A and ITEM_B were viewed, col. 19, lines 21-24),* (col. 19, line 29 to col. 20, line 33).

As per claim 31, Smith teaches a method for analyzing two sets of properties from a plurality of sets of properties, comprising the steps of: determining a set of properties common to the two sets of properties *(i.e. ITEM_A and ITEM_B were viewed, col. 19, lines 21-24);* determining the number of sets of properties from the plurality of sets of properties that include the set of common properties (col. 19, lines 8-63);

assessing the distance between the two sets of properties as a function of the number of sets of properties that include the set of common properties *(i.e. N_{common}, that is the number of sessions in which both ITEM_A and ITEM_B were viewed, col. 19, lines 21-24).*

As per claim 32, Smith teaches a method for analyzing the relationship between two items in a collection of items, wherein each item in the collection is associated with a set of properties, comprising the steps of obtaining a set of properties with which the two items are commonly associated *(i.e. ITEM_A and ITEM_B were viewed, col. 19, lines 21-24)* (col. 18, line 59 to col. 19, line 27);

determining the degree of commonality between the two items as a function of the number of items in the collection that are associated with all of the properties with which the two items are commonly associated *(i.e. N_{common}, that is the number of sessions in which both ITEM_A and ITEM_B were viewed, col. 19, lines 21-24)* (col. 19, line 29 to col. 20, line 33).

As per claim 38, Smith teaches a computer system for managing data records comprising: an information retrieval subsystem that stores and retrieves data records, each data record being associated with a set of properties (col. 18, lines 15-67);

a similarity search subsystem that receives similarity search queries and processes similarity search queries based on a distance function *(i.e. pseudocode in Table 2, col. 19)*, a similarity search query being associated with a first set of properties *(i.e. set of ITEM_A, ITEM_C ..., which belongs to query, Fig. 3B, col. 18, lines 14-24), col. 18, lines 14-45, col. 20, lines 34-44);*

wherein the distance function determines a distance between the query and a data record in the collection having a second set of properties based on determining a third set of properties common to the first set of properties and the second set of properties, and determining the number of data records in the collection that are associated with all of the properties in the third set of properties *(i.e. ITEM_A and ITEM_B were viewed, col. 19, lines 21-24),* (col. 19, line 29 to col. 20, line 33).

As per claim 2, Smith teaches the step of associating each item in the collection with a set of properties (col. 19, lines 1-63, see Table 2, col. 19).

As per claim 3, Smith teaches the step of obtaining a result includes identifying one or more result items whose distance from the query is within a first threshold (col. 18, lines 46-49, col. 19, lines 53-63).

As per claim 4, Smith teaches the step of obtaining a result includes ranking the one or more result items according to their distance from the query (col. 19, lines 53-63, col. 20, lines 21-33).

As per claim 5, Smith teaches the threshold is defined as a number of result items (col. 18, lines 35-57, col. 20, lines 6-33).

As per claim 6, Smith teaches the threshold is defined as a distance (col. 19, lines 53-63, col. 20, lines 21-33).

As per claim 7, Smith teaches the step of returning the result (col. 18, line 28 to col. 19, line 27).

As per claim 8, Smith teaches the step of obtaining a query includes the step of mapping a received query to a set of one or more properties (col. 15, lines 9-28, col. 20, line 34 to col. 21, line 33).

As per claim 9, Smith teaches one or more of the properties are binary (col. 22, lines 54-67).

As per claim 12, Smith teaches the properties are grouped into equivalence classes (i.e. sessions, col. 18, lines 14-45, col. 20, lines 34-44).

As per claim 15, Smith teaches the query corresponds to a single item (item_A, item_B, Fig. 3B) in the collection (col. 18, lines 14-45, col. 20, lines 34-44).

As per claim 16, Smith teaches the query corresponds to a plurality of items in the collection (col. 18, lines 14-45, col. 20, lines 34-44).

As per claim 17, Smith teaches the query (item_A, item_B) is independent of the items in the collection (popular_A, popular_B, col. 18, lines 14-45, col. 20, lines 34-44).

As per claim 18, Smith teaches the step of obtaining a result is constrained to a subcollection of the items in the collection (col. 18, lines 35-45, col. 30, lines 42-64).

As per claim 19, Smith teaches the subcollection is specified as an expression of properties (i.e. sessions in which items are viewed, col. 18, lines 14-45, col. 20, lines 34-44).

As per claim 20, Smith teaches the expression includes a subset of the set of properties that compose the query (col. 30, lines 42-64).

As per claim 21, Smith specifically teaches the step of obtaining a query includes identifying certain properties to be ignored in the step of obtaining a result (col. 18, lines 35-45, col. 26, line 64 to col. 27, line 32, col. 30, lines 5-64).

As per claim 22, Smith teaches the distance function is applied explicitly (col. 19, lines 1-63, col. 30, lines 42-52).

As per claim 23, Smith teaches the distance function is applied implicitly (col. 19, lines 1-63, col. 30, lines 42-52).

As per claim 25, Smith teaches the step of obtaining a result includes ranking the potential result items by frequency and selecting the potential result items having higher frequencies (col. 20, lines 6-46, col. 20, lines 64 to col. 21, line 33).

As per claim 26, Smith teaches the step of obtaining a result includes iterating through one or more subsets of the query and identifying items associated with the one or more subsets (col. 30, lines 5-34, col. 26, line 64 to col. 27, line 8).

As per claim 27, Smith teaches the one or more subsets are prioritized according to the number of items in the collection that have all of the properties in each subset and wherein iterating through one or more subsets of the query is continued until a first threshold is reached (col. 19, lines 1-63, col. 18, lines 46-58).

As per claim 34, Smith teaches the instructions cause the computer to obtain a result by identifying exactly the items whose distance from the query is within a threshold (col. 20, lines 6-9, col. 19, lines 29-63, Fig. 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US Patent No. 6,853,982 B2), in view of Fish et al. (US Patent No. 6,035,294).

As per claim 10, Smith does not specifically teach one or more of the properties are related by a partial order, and wherein, if an item is associated with a property, then the item is also associated with all ancestors of that property in the partial order. Fish teaches this limitation at col. 4, lines 28-64, Figs. 3B-C.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references because Fish's teaching of displaying information relating to the usage with which data values have historically been used with particular parameters in describing specific types of items would have allowed Smith's users to automatically identify items that are related to one another based on the activities of a community of users and to efficiently recommend products to a user based on the searches recently conducted by the user.

As per claim 11, Fish teaches one or more of the properties represent numerical values or ranges, and wherein the partial order reflects a set of containment relationships among the numerical values or ranges (col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 2).

7. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US Patent No. 6,853,982 B2), in view of Tso et al. (US Patent No. 6,385,602 B1).

As per claim 13, Smith, Fish do not explicitly teach the step of grouping the properties into equivalence classes using clustering. However, Tso teaches this limitation at col. 4, lines 42-55.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references because Tso's suggestion of determining candidate categories, final categories based upon the candidate categories and assigning the matching data items to the final categories are collectively referred to as clustering would have allowed Smith's users to obtain a large number of matching data items in an organized manner.

As per claim 14, Smith teaches each property has a set of subproperties, wherein the clustering is performed such that the distance between two properties in the collection is correlated to the number of properties in the collection that are associated with all of the subproperties common to both properties (col. 15, line 46 to col. 16, line 40).

8. Claims 24, 28-30, 35-37, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US Patent No. 6,853,982 B2), in view of Kortge et al. (US Patent No. 6,446,068 B1).

As per claim 24, Smith does not specifically teach the step of obtaining a result includes the step of iterating a random walk process to select potential result items. However, Kortge teaches this limitation at col. 10, lines 49-61, col. 14, lines 46-54.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references because Kortge's teaching the step of obtaining a result includes the step of iterating a random walk process to select potential result items would have allowed Smith's users to find a near neighbor to a query with fewer distance computations and can make use of previous search result to speed up subsequent searches on similar queries.

As per claim 28, Smith does not expressly teach the step of obtaining a result includes applying a Euclidean distance function. However, Kortge teaches this limitation at col. 8, lines 7-12.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references because Kortge's teaching the step of obtaining a result includes applying a Euclidean distance function would have allowed Smith's users to find a near neighbor to a query with fewer distance computations and can make use of previous search result to speed up subsequent searches on similar queries.

As per claim 29, Kortge teaches the step of obtaining a result includes merging a first result determined by applying the distance function and a second result determined by applying the Euclidean distance function (col. 8, lines 5-12).

As per claim 30, Kortge teaches the step of obtaining a result includes determining a first result by applying either the distance function or the Euclidean distance function and applying the other distance function to the first result (col. 8, lines 5-12).

As per claim 35, Smith does not expressly teach the instructions cause the computer to obtain a result by identifying approximately the items whose distance from the query is within a threshold according to a heuristic. However, Kortge teaches this limitation at col. 6, lines 27-46.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references because Kortge's teaching the step of the instructions cause the computer to obtain a result by identifying approximately the items whose distance from the query is within a threshold according to a heuristic would have allowed Smith's users to find a near neighbor to a query with fewer distance computations and can make use of previous search result to speed up subsequent searches on similar queries.

As per claim 36, Kortge teaches the heuristic permits a trade-off between the accuracy and the performance of a search (col. 6, lines 27-46).

As per claim 37, Kortge teaches the heuristic includes the use of a random walk process (col. 10, lines 49-61, col. 14, lines 46-54).

As per claim 39, Smith does not specifically teach a clustering subsystem that employs the distance function of the similarity search subsystem to construct a graph. However, Kortge teaches this limitation at col. 9, lines 10-45, Fig. 5.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references because Kortge's teaching the step of a clustering subsystem that employs the distance function of the similarity search subsystem to construct a graph would have allowed Smith's users to find a near neighbor to a query with fewer distance computations and can make use of previous search result to speed up subsequent searches on similar queries.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 08/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. Claims 1, 33, 38, Smith does teach a distance between a query and a session.

According to the teaching of Smith, there are two sessions:

Session 1 consists of popular_A and Other_Item_B

Session 2 consists of popular_A, Other_Item_B, and Other_Item_C.

By applying the step of computing the distance between two sessions at col. 18, lines 58-67, Popular_A and Item_B have two sessions in common.

Examiner's interpretation of Claim 1 is shown in the following table:

Claim 1	Examiner's Interpretation based on the teaching of Smith
A query	for each other_item (See the pseudocode in Table 2, col. 19)
A first set of properties	Popular_A, Other_Item_B in Session 1
An item	Session 2
A second set of properties	popular_A, Other_Item_B, Other_Item_C in Session 2
Applying a distance function to the query and an item	increment common-session-count (See the pseudocode in Table 2, col. 19.
A third set of properties common to the first set of properties and the second set of properties.	Popular_A, Other_Item_B
The distance function determines a distance between the query and the items based on the number of items that are associated with all the properties in the third set.	The number of sessions that are common to both items, col. 19, lines 1-29.

According to the Applicant' specification, "The distance between Die Hard and Die Hard 2 is computed as follow. The intersection of their property sets is {Star: Bruce Willis, Genre: Action, Series: Die Hard}. All three movies in the Die Hard series have all of these properties. Hence, the distance between the two movies is 3", page 14, lines 20-30, a step of computing a

distance between two items is merely a step of computing a number of items or a set of properties share all the properties, e.g. the distance between the two movies is 3. Therefore, the distance and the number of items share all the properties are equal.

Pursuant to the Applicant' specification, page 14, lines 20-30, the pseudocode in Table 2 of Smith similarly disclosed the same steps of computing the number of session in common, or computing a distance between session 1 and session 2. The number of sessions share all the properties, Popular_A, Other_Item_B, should be understood as a distance between the two sessions. In accordance with the Applicant's above example, the number of sessions having common properties Popular_A, Other_Item_B is 2, or the distance between the two sessions is 2, the value 2 is computed by the "increment common-session-count" in the pseudocode.

Therefore, the "increment common-session-count" in the pseudocode equates to the function to compute the distance between two sessions.

Claim 33 is the computer program product, residing on a computer readable medium comprising instructions to perform the method of claim 1, under similar rationale as provided in claim 1, the same reasoning would be applicable to claim 33.

In claim 38, Smith teaches the distance between the two sessions as the number of sessions having common properties, as discussed in the above example, the "similarity search" of claim 38 equates to computing the number of sessions (i.e. search for sessions) having common properties.

B. Claim 31, Smith does teach a distance between the two sets of items.

As noted, Smith discloses two sessions:

Session 1 consists of popular_A and Other_Item_B

Session 2 consists of popular_A, Other_Item_B, and Other_Item_C.

By applying the step of computing the distance between two sessions at col. 18, lines 58-67, Popular_A and Item_B have two sessions in common.

Examiner's interpretation of Claim 31 is shown in the following table:

Claim 31	Examiner's Interpretation based on the teaching of Smith.
A first set of properties.	Popular_A, Other_Item_B in Session 1
A second set of properties.	popular_A, Other_Item_B, Other_Item_C in Session 2
A set of properties common to the two set of properties.	Popular_A, Other_Item_B
The number of sets of properties that include the set of common properties.	The number of sessions that are common to both items, col. 19, lines 1-29.
Accessing the distance between the two sets of properties that include the set of common properties.	increment common-session-count (See the pseudocode in Table 2, col. 19.

As discussed in A, a step of computing a distance between two items according to Applicants is merely a step of computing a number of items or a set of properties share all the properties, e.g. the distance between the two movies is 3 (See Application, page 14, lines 20-30). Therefore, the distance and the number of items share all the properties are equal.

The pseudocode in Table 2 of Smith illustrated the steps of computing the number of session in common, or computing a distance between session 1 and session 2. The number of sessions share all the properties, Popular_A, Other_Item_B, should be understood as a distance between the two sessions. Pursuant to the Applicant's specification, page 14, lines 20-30, Smith analogously discloses the number of sessions having common properties Popular_A, Other_Item_B is 2, or the distance between the two sessions is 2, the 2-value is computed by the "increment common-session-count" in the pseudocode.

Therefore, the "increment common-session-count" in the pseudocode reads on accessing the distance between two sessions.

C. Claim 32, Smith does teach determining a degree of commonality between the two items

In Smith's reference, there are two sessions:

Session 1 consists of popular_A and Other_Item_B

Session 2 consists of popular_A, Other_Item_B, and Other_Item_C.

By applying the step of computing the distance between two sessions at col. 18, lines 58-67, Popular_A and Item_B have two sessions in common.

Examiner's interpretation of Claim 32 is shown in the following table:

Claim 32	Examiner's Interpretation based on the teaching of Smith.
A first item.	Session 1

A second item.	Session 2
A first set of properties.	Popular_A, Other_Item_B
A second set of properties.	popular_A, Other_Item_B, Other_Item_C in Session 2
A set of properties with which the two items are commonality associated.	Popular_A, Other_Item_B
Determining the degree of commonality between the two items.	The number of sessions that are common to both items, col. 19, lines 1-29.
a function of the number of items in the collection that are associated with all of the properties with which the two items are commonly associated.	increment common-session-count (See the pseudocode in Table 2, col. 19.

As discussed, the step of computing a distance or the degree of commonality between two items, according to the Applicant' specification, page 14, lines 20-30, is merely a step of computing a number of items or a set of properties share all the properties, e.g. "The distance between Die Hard and Die Hard 2 is computed as follow. The intersection of their property sets is {Star: Bruce Willis, Genre: Action, Series: Die Hard}. All three movies in the Die Hard series have all of these properties. Hence, the distance between the two movies is 3". It is thus the

distance (or the degree of commonality) and the number of items share all the properties are equal.

Further, pursuant to the Applicant' specification, page 14, lines 20-30, the pseudocode in Table 2 of Smith disclosed the steps of computing the number of session in common, or the degree of commonality between session 1 and session 2 which is similar to the above example. The number of session share all the properties, Popular_A, Other_Item_B, should be understood as the degree of commonality between the two sessions. Hence, the number of sessions has common properties Popular_A, Other_Item_B is 2, or the degree of commonality between the two sessions is 2, the 2-value is computed by the "increment common-session-count" in the pseudocode.

Therefore, the "increment common-session-count" in the pseudocode can be equated with a function of the number of common sessions (i.e. items in claim 31).

Examiner recognizes the fact that although the Applicant might have thought the claimed invention somewhat differs from the prior art Smith et al. (US Patent No. 6,853,982 B2), the claim language, however, is broad in scope enough to be met by the prior art. The Applicant is advised to clarify the claim language so that it can fully reflect the nature and structure/function of such a process, and distinct from the prior art.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-4112. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham, can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax number to this Art Unit is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Miranda Le
October 23, 2006

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100